

Valley Center Design Review Board

Proposed Minutes: Oct. 12th, 2010

DRB Members present: Robertson, Montgomery, Moore, Herr, Splane (as well as non-voting DRB Volunteer Michael Mahan)

Public attendees - Jon Vick

Scheduled Projects:

Matz Commercial Bldg, Old Castle Rd.

Site Plan Modification to Automotive Specialists 2, Lizard Rock

Site Plan Replacement- Miller Rd. Plaza, Miller Rd. & V.C. Rd.

4PM Lael Montgomery opened the meeting.
There were no speakers for Public Forum.

Site Plan S-10-10

Matz Commercial Building

8917 Old Castle Rd.

No presenter was present

The DRB examined the Site Plan for a commercial building proposed for the former location of the country store and Mexican food restaurant at 8917 Old Castle Rd, near old 395).

Overall, the site plan, landscape plan and elevations are confusing and lack detail necessary to determine whether or not these plans comply with Valley Center's Design Guidelines. (See Valley Center's Design Guidelines for details.) Of particular concern in Valley Center is the retention of mature oaks and sycamores. The plan for the oaks and sycamores needs to be clarified. These trees should be retained in the landscape, and incorporated into the landscape plan to the greatest extent possible. DPW too often makes demands for excessive road improvements that unnecessarily destroy the character of backcountry communities.

It is difficult to tell exactly what is being proposed for Indian Hill Road. This is NOT a Circulation Element road. What is being proposed here? It appears that either easements or road widening (both appear excessive for a non CE road) will cause the removal of several mature oaks and a large sycamore tree.

Elevations appear to show a "western ranch house" architectural style that Valley Center's Design Guidelines support. Again, however, the plans need to describe materials and colors for the roof, siding and architectural detailing.

Valley Center's Design Guidelines call for landscaping that is natural in design, and uses plant materials that are locally predominant. This site is covered with majestic oaks and sycamores, none of them shown in the landscape plan. We would like to see a new landscaping plan designed around the existing trees using compatible native plant material that grows successfully under oaks. In addition, our Guidelines require special care of these majestic trees during construction.

Site Plan Modification S03-021-W1

Automotive Specialists 2, 28477 Lizard Rocks Road

Presenters: Napoleon Zervas & Jerry Gaughan

A second, industrial building (next to the recently completed "Impact Auto Building") was presented using renderings and drawings. The building was found to be well designed with large window areas and staggered roof lines to facilitate both industrial tenants in the short term, while also being appropriate for retail tenants, as zoning changes in the future. It was stressed that the 8' wide roll up doors we're not exposed to the front of the building by to its sides.

While reviewing finishes it was agreed that the main structure would be of a medium tan stucco; while the trim will be lighter value tan and the tower an even lighter shade than the trim. The design of the de-bossed (or embossed) detail for the tower is to be refined, possibly to a quadrifoil.

When discussing signage, Splane suggested pierced patentated metal wall signs for the new building. The DRB agreed that the signage for both buildings on this site should be coordinated. The proponents agreed to require their tenants, Impact Auto, to replace the blue plastic-lettering that currently identifies the Impact Auto building that shares this site. The proponents agreed also that the temporary "now open" signage that their tenants are displaying will be removed in a few weeks, and to create a monument sign for the property.

While discussing the landscaping for the plan, Moore suggested that the eucalyptus be replaced with California pepper to which the applicants agreed.

The proponents agreed to make these changes to the Site Plan in time for the project to be reviewed by the Planning Group. With these changes, the Site Plan Modification was approved.

Site Plan Replacement SO8-013

-Miller Road. Plaza, Miller Rd. & Valley Center Rd.

(Presenters: Napoleon Zervas & Jerry Gaughn)

The Site Plan for the plaza has been modified to include a large retaining wall on the east property boundary (Shoemaker property) The retaining wall is approximately 200 feet' long, and steps-down from its highest point of 22 feet at the northeast corner of the commercially-zoned property to approximately 6-feet at the southeast corner. feet'

The proponents stressed that the retaining wall was required by the County; that the Shoemakers would not allow the Miller Plaza developers to grade the hill on the Shoemaker property in order to reduce the height of a retaining wall; that the wall would exceeded 20' in height for about 20 running feet. The wall itself will be planted with fast-growing climbing and hanging plants; its looming height will be softened by a landscaped strip between the structures, parking areas, driveways and pedestrian paths. Vegetation will be supported by automatic drip irrigation.

Board members all expressed disappointment that a “freeway-style” retaining wall would slip into the Site Plan at the end of Site Plan process when so much had already been invested in the plan. There was much discussion about the assertion that the wall would be “hidden” by the structures that the proponent plans as restaurants. Montgomery said and Moore agreed that the concept of using any one of a few traditionally “authentic” architectures in village development would be undermined by a looming wall that looks like it belongs on a freeway. The proponents claimed that the height of the wall prevented other alternatives. DRB Members could conceive of no other alternatives. As a result, members agreed the modification would be approved with changes.

The proponents agreed that the 22-foot retaining wall was not their choice, and that they had made every effort to devise a more compatible solution.

Susan Moore suggested that both hanging and climbing plants should be used for the landscaped wall. Plants that should be planted to hang down are asterisked (*). The climbing up ones will be slower growing, and the down ones will provide quicker growth, and more color. Plants are:

- Bougainvillea* (could use 2 or 3 different colors including white)
- Lonicera (Honeysuckle)
- Vinca
- Distictis (trumpet vines)*
- Solanum jasminoides*
- Ficus pumila
- Pyrostegia venusta*

Minutes Moore moved that the minutes from September be approved as is. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Chair's Announcements

Chairwoman Montgomery had announcements regarding the Oct. 20th review of the General Plan.

Montgomery officially adjourned the meeting at 5:50 PM.